

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-10, 12, and 15-47 will be pending. By this amendment, claims 11, 13, and 14 have been canceled; and claims 1, 15, 21, 27, 32, 38, and 44 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

§102 Rejection of Claims 1-47

In Section 2 of the Office Action of April 12, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as "the Office Action"), claims 1-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Cheah (U.S. Patent No. 6,788,953).

Embodiments of the present invention provide methods and apparatus for implementing a phone system providing a local area wireless connection (e.g., a cordless operation using a handset wirelessly connected to a terminal unit) and a wide area wireless connection (e.g., a WLL operation using the terminal unit having two modems). In one implementation, the phone system "provides a wireless local loop interface to communicate with a cellular or PCS network and a cordless telephone interface to communicate with a cordless handset." (*Specification, page 2, lines 31-33*). Thus, there is a need for a control unit that provides "[t]he terminal unit and handset ... [to] operate together to allow a user to enter commands to control the terminal unit through the handset and to control the handset through the terminal unit" (*Specification, page 8, lines 6-8*) and to couple to "the [two] modems 205, 210 [to] operate together to place and receive telephone calls through the

wireless network" (*Specification, page 5, lines 17-19*) using the cordless handset.

For example, the structure of a phone system of claim 1 comprises:

a terminal unit comprising:

*a first antenna,
a first modem connected to said first antenna,*

*a second antenna,
a second modem connected to said second antenna,*

*a modem interface connected to said first modem and to
said second modem, and*

*a terminal control block coupled to and operating together
with said first modem and said second modem to
effectively process and interpret commands received at
the terminal unit;*

wherein said first modem provides a first air interface using said
first antenna for short range communication,

said second modem provides a second air interface using said
second antenna, and said second air interface is different
than said first air interface.

(emphasis added)

Accordingly, in one aspect of claim 1, the terminal unit of the phone system includes
two modems (i.e., the first modem and the second modem) and a terminal control block
coupled to and operating together with the first modem and the second modem to effectively
process and interpret commands received at the terminal unit, in addition to the modem
interface. See *Specification, page 5, lines 17-19 and page 8, lines 6-8.*

By contrast, the interface module 18 (similar to the modem interface 235) of Cheah
merely "receives the standard POTS telephone call progress signal from the cordless base unit
and converts the same into other signals utilized by the cellular transceiver." *Cheah, column*

5, lines 36-39. Thus, Cheah fails to disclose a terminal control block coupled to and operating together with first modem and second modem to process and interpret commands received at the terminal unit. Although the Office Action indicates that the terminal control block is taught by the RF manager 102 of Cheah, it seems the RF manager 102 interfaces only with the handset 12. "An RF manager 102 receives events from the cordless telephone handset 12, dispatches transmission commands to the handset 12, manages the RF channel information and controls the RF phase locked loop." Further, Figures 1, 2, and 6 of Cheah clearly show that the RF manager 102, which is part of the cordless phone base station 14, interfaces only with the handset 12.

Based on the foregoing discussion, it is submitted that Cheah fails to teach or suggest all limitations of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 should be allowable over Cheah. Since independent claims 15, 21, 27, 32, 38, and 44 closely parallel, and recite similar limitations as recited in, claim 1, claims 15, 21, 27, 32, 38, and 44 should also be allowable over Cheah. Further, since claims 2-10, 12, 16-20, 21-26, 28-31, 33-37, 39-43, and 45-47 depend from one of claims 1, 15, 21, 27, 32, 38, and 44, claims 2-10, 12, 16-20, 21-26, 28-31, 33-37, 39-43, and 45-47 should also be allowable over Cheah.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1-47 based upon 35 U.S.C. §102(b) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-10, 12, and 15-47 in view of the remarks and submit that all pending claims are presently in condition for allowance.

In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept. 7, 2006

By:


Samuel S. Lee
Reg. No. 42,791

Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch LLP
530 B Street, Suite 2100
San Diego, California 92101-4469
(619) 525-3821